

Redacted Minutes: 2013 ADHO Steering Committee Meeting

Redacted Minutes: 2013 ADHO Steering Committee Meeting

U. Nebraska, Lincoln: Sunday, 14 July, and Tuesday, 16 July 2013

VOTING MEMBERS present during this meeting:

aaDH (1 member):

- Paul Arthur (PA)

ACH (2 members):

- Bethany Nowviskie (BN)
- Jarom McDonald (JM)

centerNet: (1 member):

- Katherine Walter (KW)

CSDH/SCHN (1 member):

- Michael Sinatra (MS)

EADH (3 members):

- Melissa Terras (MT)
- John Nerbonne (JN)
- Tomoji Tabata (TT)

JADH (1 member, observer only):

- Charles Muller (CM)

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:

- Ray Siemens (RS)
- David Beavan (DB)
- Elisabeth Burr (EB)
- Øyvind Eide (OE)
- Harold Short (HS)
- Edward Vanhoutte (EV)
- Susan Brown (SB)
- Lisa Spiro (LS)
- Neil Fraistat (NF)
- Glen Worthey (GW)
- Dan O'Donnell (DO)
- Paul Spence (PS)

Action items indicated in RED.

Completed action items indicated in RED STRIKEOUT.

Matters resolved during meeting indicated in GREEN.

FIRST MEETING: Sunday, July 14, 2013; 9:00 a.m.

ROOM: Embassy Suites, Executive Board Room

9:08. Call to Order (Neil, 30 min.)

Minutes and note-taking: notes to be taken via shared Google Doc

NF thanks the attendees for a year of hard work.

NF confirmed that all voting members in attendance.

Matters arising (urgent matters that require a spot on the agenda): None.

The committee observed a moment of silence for Lisa-Lena Opas-Hänninen.

9:30. Treasurer's report (Paul, 60 min.)

General Points

Crucial to know what can be claimed as expenses: see "genintro-adho-fin.docx"

Currently, 70% of LLC income (minus expenses) comes to ADHO; roughly 65% of that income comes from institutional subs, (most of) rest from individual subs

Budget year = Calendar year (thus we're discussing the budget for a FY that is already half over - a customary situation that has seemed to work)

LLC income report (produced by OUP) for 2012, and projections for 2013 reviewed. PS notes that there are slight differences between reporting from business side of OUP, and from the arm that arranges subscriptions/relationship to ADHO (e.g., in whether or not individual and institutional subs are distinguished - an important distinction for ADHO)

Reports for FY 2012

Generally good figures, in spite of some apparently higher expenditures (some of which comes back to us in the form of editorial subventions)

In past, in order to determine the geographic distribution of LLC subs (which determines allocation of income to COs), we had to go through various OUP reports and combine figures from various cells; this is now easier thanks to changes in OUP reporting.

Great increase in both individual subs (due to a successful conference) and solid increase in institutional subs over the past year.

Non-subscription income includes LLC production costs that they returned to us, some less-than-expected expenditures from previous years, etc.

Intriguing corporate subscription -- first ever for LLC. Unclear who or why subscribed as "corporate" (believed to be from Australia), but ADHO receives same distribution of that sort of income as of other.

We have information about geographic location of individual subscribers, as well as subscriber choice as to which CO they join while subscribing. This choice is shown, but not taken into account upon distribution (which is shared equally)

Question about the new "membership only" (non-subscription) option. Clarification that these will be counted as individual subs for purposes of income distribution. They weren't available in the 2012 year, but will start to show up on next year's distribution.

EV notes that "editorial costs" as noted by OUP are not money that goes to him as editor -- perhaps other terminology would help clarify. JN notes that there may be a decision by EADH (tomorrow) to request increases in actual editorial costs, and that this should be considered ADHO income, not EADH income. JN will report on outcome of that discussion at follow-up meeting.

Expenditures: as we've decided. Distributions to COs, publication subventions, awards and bursaries. Backstop allocations were generally not used last year. Some changes over the past year: cleaning up budget headings (clearing problems and inconsistencies that had developed historically), as well as the decision to fund the very important Infrastructure Cmte work (about which we'll hear later). PS informs us that some budget headings (e.g. those remaining from previous EADH categories) still need to be removed or reconciled.

Question about content management as a "publication" subvention. Suggestion that this cost should be a backstop for publications committee, not infrastructure. PS agrees, and will change that heading.

Awards Cmte notes that Chad Gaffield donated his 2011 prize money back to ADHO, was used for 2 bursaries in 2012.

Backstop funding for exploring ADHO legal status has not yet been used, but it will be.

Summary: ADHO income was roughly GBP 73k, but expenditures were roughly only 52k (including money still owed to centerNet - which is not actually a saving, but rather money that needs to be kept for distribution to centerNet, once it is set up to receive funding). PS reports

that, over all, 2012 was a very healthy budget year for us.

Extra bursaries thanks to donations from Patrick Juola and the bursary award given to DHSI in gratitude to Ray (in addition to the Gaffield donation noted above).

We no longer have a separate Infrastructure budget category, but some figures / remainders have been turned into a new category for FY2013. NF notes that our sys admin has been tremendously helpful, and in general that the Infrastructure Cmte experiment has been a great success.

Contingency lines: normally 1k, but PS has added another 5k contingency line in order to make ADHO more financially safe as it grows and moves toward incorporation, etc. (more details to come). Even with this addition, we have quite a bit higher than last year. PS has been deliberately conservative, and both this fact and increased income have been rewarded in the budget surplus.

Revenue distribution 2013

Calculation of income distribution to COs related to number of voting members of ADHO SC.

Important clarification that geographical basis of institutional subs is what determines the proportional distribution to COs.

Conclusions & Questions

Question whether we might make at least part of our budgetary reports public, in order to respond to criticisms of our expenditures. General agreement: a simple, publicly available, easily found description of our budget would be welcome. PS notes that his 1-page public document (meant for distribution at the ADHO AGM) would be appropriate for public distribution. PS will send to the group for review, then if all agree, will post to the ADHO website. NF calls for informal vote on this; all agree. **Action on Lisa: Post Paul S.'s 1-p. budget document on ADHO website.**

At end of today, PS will post a new and updated version of the budget for discussion and approval by COs. Doesn't anticipate major changes from what is already posted.

PS gives strong recommendation to start saving a "rainy day fund" in case of economic downturn. PS proposes that EADH contribute an 5k, and that ADHO set aside an additional 5k, as a starter pot of "reserves" in anticipation of ADHO incorporation. All agree this is a good idea, and thank EADH for the offer (formalized by EADH in the run-up to the conference).

(Question whether there are requirements for particular reserves that are required for incorporation. PS notes that the opposite has been true for EADH: that for a non-profit in England/Wales, we are required *not* to show too great a stockpile.)

Some attendees share experience with other similar organizations' approach to reserves, e.g., ALA keeps a 6-month budgetary reserve, as do several Canadian non-profits.

Question whether there's been a discussion about what to do with those reserves: invest, etc. PS

notes that this is something for the new treasurer to implement. **Action on Jarom: start discussion and decide what to do with ADHO budget reserves.**

Regarding handover to new treasurer (JM), PS recommends rather than a one-time sharp delineation and handover of duties on 1 Jan, that PS and JM work together for the coming year. PS will finish off 2013 accounts, work with JM on 2014 from the start, and have a long transition period. Chair notes that we created a “Deputy Treasurer” position for JM, who will then move into ADHO position. ACH expresses gratitude for allowing this smooth transition (which enables JM to continue transitioning out of his ACH duties). NF likewise thanks ACH for so generously “sharing” JM with ADHO.

10:30. Proposals for New Committees or Additional Committee Members (Neil, 45 min.)

Communication Committee (Lisa Spiro)

LS: in spite of great advances in the past year, LS has realized that communications constitute a much bigger task than one person can successfully handle. Thus her proposal (attached to Meeting Docs) to establish a standing Comm Cmte

Outline of proposal: restructure ADHO website, make it more outwardly-facing (less insider talk, etc.); better manage stream of communications from COs and publications, allowing ADHO to amplify these communications; distribute task of managing social media presence (NF notes that ADHO Twitter acct has been “Lisa and me... when we have time...” -- justifying need for a more robust handling of this and other).

Request for clarification on division of labor btw Comm Cmte and Pubs Cmte. LS notes that Pubs are journals, book series, etc.; Comm is communications, website, newsletters, social media.

Note that this (ad hoc communications cmte) comes out of last year’s ADHO meetings, during which the need to separate responsibilities. Suggestion to make this separation of duties public and obvious up front.

General comment on large size of many committees: general agreement that this representational “committee bloat” is a problem (esp. once SIGs and COs increase in number). Suggestion of some sort of “communication tree”, even if the Comm Cmte doesn’t include reps from every single organization. Suggestion that we also rely on “systematic” (push-button) type processes, rather than relying on lots of people to discuss and approve everything.

Suggestion of hiring e.g. grad students as occasional “official correspondents” for us. Reply that this could allow us to rethink / refresh ADHO home page as, e.g., blog posts. Suggestion that this sort of coordination role should be explicitly included in duties of Comm. Cmte.

Note that the ADHO Comm Cmte should focus more on *amplification* of communications created by COs, and that CO messages need to retain their particular geographic and cultural “autonomy” so that the flow of communications comes more from grass-roots,- and avoiding both the appearance and possibility of top-down, ADHO hegemony. A suggestion of specific information feeds (and other content) coming directly from COs could go directly on ADHO

front page.

Chair notes the general sympathy of the room that this go forward, first with a revised proposal, then discussion and vote.

JN moves, MS seconds, that we “approve in principle” the creation of the Communications Cmte, and then come back to the group for approving revised proposal. Motion carries unanimously. Action on Lisa: Revise proposal for Communications Cmte, and present to SC for approval.

Listener and Observer status on committees (Neil)

To clarify difference between “listener” and “observer” status, and to ask: do we need to have these roles specified, or should we simply nominate particular individuals to a particular status?

Preference expressed that we have much more transparency, and note that the “listener/observer” status has sometimes led to ill-will and non-collegial relations.

Several note that we should simply make appointments to committees (rather than have automatic membership), then entrust these appointees with the decisions of the cmte. Notes that there is no strong need for bloated committees with unclear roles. (As evidence of committee bloat, note that we currently have 27 members of the 2014 PC.)

Some agreement that this phenomenon is a result of simple growing pains.

Question about Multilingual/Multicultural Cmte listeners on both PC and SC lists; belief expressed that this "listener" role has been very helpful (if overwhelming) in many cases. Is MLMC a special case?

A note that Local Organizers should have listening (e.g. non-voting) members on PC.

Difference noted between “non-voting member” and “listener”. Desire expressed for at the least greater clarity in these roles.

Some agreement with the “growing pains” diagnosis, suggestion of thinking about this in terms of “executives and committees” -- but prediction that we’ll always have actual problems including “everyone who actually needs to be at the table” without having bloat.

Note that next agenda item, “inclusivity group,” may helpfully be blended with this one. Chair concurs: discuss both issues, then see where we stand on both.

Noted that, esp. for smaller COs, having the CO executive as an automatic member of certain committees has been very helpful.

Chair would like to charge Secretariat to gather numbers of listener/observer problems: fact-finding on the cmte bloat. Let’s find out what we’re dealing with (e.g., to document the “patently absurd” bloat of current PC). A census that will be followed by a proposal to vote on -- by early September. Motion carries. **Action on Secretariat: fact-finding about committee bloat by gathering number of listeners/observers on various committees.**

Inclusivity Working Group (Neil)

Over the past year we've seen that "inclusivity" is not only a matter of traditional MLMC concerns, but also includes disciplinarity and many other vectors of inclusion. Asks us to consider how actively we can promote inclusion of traditionally excluded or marginalized from our meetings and proceedings.

Proposes idea of creating "Working Group on Inclusivity," led by BN -- and if approved, what sort of representation on it? Not just people from SC, but also people from groups that may be likely to feel excluded. Would review existing protocols, etc. Would like sense of committee.

Some concurrence with importance of the idea, notes that it includes not only disciplinary, but also organizational inclusion. Notes that this impinges on e.g. how awards (and explicitly bursaries) are handled.

Question about how strongly this "inclusivity idea" is influenced by disciplinary, geographic, cultural aspects. Worries about the sort of horse-trading that it could lead to.

Other expression of strong support for this Group, tempered with belief that it needs a very strong charge: it should look at the way we have embodied (or failed) principles that we believe we share. Should review current practice and recommend changes. Should resist the bloat that could result from overly literal reading of "inclusivity" on this very committee! Would like to see "wonky" approach for start: just examining protocols.

Follow-up with concern that we may end up having the work get out of phase. Is concerned that there are some aspects with possibly even "legal" concerns about representation, and can foresee the "two tasks" - the bloated cmte problem, and the inclusivity problem - may interfere with each other.

Clarification: not implying that these are the same problem/question, but only that they're closely related, and impinge on each other.

Suggestion of two different groups: a "bylaws" sort of group, and an "inclusivity" sort of group, working closely together.

Question whether this might make MLMC obsolete; Chair clarifies that in no sense!

Suggestion of a "divide and conquer" approach, e.g. "inclusivity w/respect to X", rather than one big group. Suggestion in response that this is not a permanent cmte, but rather a temporary working group to begin identifying issues that need to pursue; some may be handled by existing cmtes, some new forms of "inclusion" will doubtless arise from SIGs, etc.

Chair suggests that we take generally acknowledged support for Inclusivity group, then follow up over email.

Action on Bethany to prepare draft proposal, which will be on agenda for second meeting.
(Done at Day 2 SC meeting.)

11:15. Structurally Integrating New Associations into ADHO (Harold, 30 min.)

Regional Associations

Result of many discussions, GO::DH and several others. Clear need to make a more generalized approach to how burgeoning activity around the world. Came up with new category of “Associate Orgs” of 3 types: 1. Regional Association (something like a regional chapter of existing CO). 2. Regionals that currently don’t have existing “regional” CO. (Notes that we tend to “nurture” new orgs anyway, e.g., JADH was greatly helped by having TT on the ALLC Exec. HS proposes a formal approach to handling). 3. Non-regional associations (e.g., discipline- or language-based), that don’t have logical CO, but just us deciding what would make most sense.

Noted that ACH has no assumed geographic basis, so this is a real inflection point for ACH in particular: about 75% North American, but even this includes many Canadian and Mexican members. So how do we function as a non-geographic CO?

Note of potential political sensitivities of having, e.g., a “US” org as the “parent” of a Latin American org. Some strong concurrence on this, on basis of GO::DH experience; likewise, e.g., European language based org acting in Africa would be problematic.

Cautious support of the idea, but notes the inherent problematic nature of it, even in connection with e.g., the German dHD org (that is, relying on OUP as its membership agent).

HS notes that EADH has an explicit responsibility to represent all of Europe, which is the structural rationale for his proposal. We want regional-based associations to be both advocates and coordinators for DH, no matter what status they have organizationally.

Financial implications: if there were a regional chapter, it could receive disbursements from its sponsor CO, but could also be supported directly from ADHO. HS notes that the implications of every financial model, and every organizational status, will have to be clearly delineated up front. But his financial models show that the ADHO approach (that is, having ADHO handle disbursements to “Associates” rather than sponsoring COs) is indeed scalable. Notes that as the membership increases (e.g., through new Associate Orgs), everyone benefits.

Question of whether, over time, the disproportion in amount returned from individual memberships, some Regional Associate Orgs may have a financial incentive NOT to become a CO. HS clarifies that this is not the case, since non-CO doesn’t benefit from institutional-subscription LLC income.

Note of strong EADH principle that we should focus on our main purpose: to promote research and DH activities, and geographic basis is extremely practical. EADH is very opposed to anything that would take away large numbers of its constituency in favor of some “separate” regional org.

A report that CSDH/SCHN has been contacted by a “French” DH org, interested to “expand” to “Francophone” -- notes that non-open-access nature of LLC will be for some a major

impediment.

HS sees great possibilities in encouraging regional and other “associate” orgs, no matter how we end up arranging / including them.

Membership-only subscriptions: about half chose to pay extra to get the journal, so our goal was apparently accomplished: drawing more people in, without cannibalizing income from journal subs. HS says, based on our healthy financial situation and OUP predictions, we could probably now contemplate offering membership-only subs to everyone (not just to students). The upcoming end of our agreement with OUP may offer us the best opportunity to revisit their policies.

Action on Harold to revise proposal for Regional Associations based on the above discussion, and resubmit to SC.

11:45. Lunch: **Lazlo’s, 7th & P Streets** (75 min.)

1:00. OUP (John/Harold, 30 min.)

Discussion of Open Access, LLC price increase, Skinning, and Currency

Open Access:

It is noted that, in rough terms, we’ve basically stated our position on OA, and OUP has basically pushed back. This issue may come up at time of renewal of OUP-EADH agreement.

Likewise noted that we should exercise extreme caution on this topic, given the great benefit that LLC relationship has entailed for our open access journals, etc. -- i.e., careful not to bite the hand that feeds us.

The very long and fruitful historical relationship of our associations w/OUP, which are really exemplary in the world of scholarly publishing, is noted.

Our point of most leverage is at point of contract negotiation, but that we’ll approach this in a balanced way, not as adversaries.

Some mention that we have many constituents that may have radically different requirements w/ r/t open access, and that it’s a fast-changing landscape -- but we need to keep in mind actual legal and political requirements of existing and new communities.

Chair suggests tasking our Pubs Cmte with surveying this question. General agreement. **Action on Publications Cmte: survey questions and implications of open access position.**

LLC price increase:

Chair notes that EADH has actual control over the price (although it’s always a negotiation)

Skinning of OUP interface with CO/local branding:

Not an infrastructural issue, but rather a communications issue, whether or not LLC is the means of gaining membership, or a membership benefit.

Proposal to task the new Comm Cmte with taking over this issue. LS agrees (and is heartily thanked!). **Action on Lisa and Communications Cmte: Create proposal for skinning of LLC site to better communicate its "membership" aspect.**

Currency issue (that is, allow payment in each subscriber's own currency):

HS reports that allowing multiple currencies is a technical issue for OUP, but it's not likely that this has a near-term solution, although OUP is perfectly willing to discuss, consider, and seek solutions. We should keep on the agenda and continue to chip away at the problem, but should not assume that there will be a quick fix for it.

Agreement that we should continue to push for it; HS agrees, and will seek to make contact with OUP technical people to try to better understand the problems. **Action on Harold: Discuss LLC skinning problems with OUP technical people.**

Membership registration process:

Some have noticed the alarmingly large number of people who are unable to complete a registration, or to find out whether they're currently members, etc., on the OUP site; even SC members confirm this problem from their own experience. Belief expressed that, among other things, possible problems completing credit card transactions. Question how many people we've lost to the frustrations of this process!

On the other hand, one member notes (reporting own and others' experience) that "customer service" aspect in resolving these problems has been admirable and good; some concurrence, but avers that the problems should not be arising in the first place. (Note though, that the recurring credit card charge process has quietly disappeared.)

Would we consider lifetime memberships? Would OUP? How about multi-year memberships? This has been possible at least for centerNet, although general agreement that this too has not been without problems. The already too-complex and potentially overwhelming process of registering is noted, along with the idea that it's a communication issue when members perceive membership as a side benefit of subscription, rather than the other way around.

HS: OUP reports no problem in principle with their receiving bulk subscriptions, e.g., coming from the CO's.

1:30. Sarah Scutts of OUP joins our discussion (30 min.)

Highlights from Publisher's Report from Sarah:

p.2ff: Aesthetic developments in home page. Commenting facility in new widget. Oxford Index launched to encourage LLC content discovery from within other OUP journals. Authentication via mobile access improved

Circulation: increase in institutional subs by about 8% in 2012; in 2013, increased further to 3,536. Individual subs likewise increased -- only much greater, 66% increase. See pp.5-6.

Citation analysis: impact factor more than doubled (based on LLC's membership in the linguistics category -- which makes the achievement all the greater). See contributing articles that contributed to this increase in impact factor. Thomson-Reuters (which determines journal categories) is apparently unable (or unwilling) to reconsider this categorization. DO would like OUP to push harder on making the impact factor more realistic (as well as encouraging other, non-impact-factor alt-metrics). Sarah says that OUP is certainly exploring alt-metrics, but (apparently) has not signed the alt-metrics statement. EV reports that this was a major topic at the OUP editor journals' meeting. Sarah reports that OUP *can* promote other metrics in addition to journal impact factor. DO reports on his participation in the Force 11 group, which holds that nobody is really happy to impact factor. EV cautions that he is still asked by many authors about the impact factor of LLC, so it's obviously still a very important topic. Also: when we first got an impact factor assigned, the number of submissions increased. BN asks who was involved in the determination of the Linguistics category; JN reports that more appropriate categories don't even exist. Both JN and EV say that we should be happy for being included at all -- an inclusion that is not automatic.

p.9: Online usage. Slightly down on individual article downloads, although the 2011 figures could be artificially inflated (for technical reasons). 2013 to-date figures significantly higher than last year's at this time.

pp.10-11: Top 40 articles. Top hit was heavily promoted (e.g. by OUP social media campaign). Readers are engaging with current content as well as historic content.

p.12: Author experience survey. Post-publication, authors are surveyed, and feedback to OUP is good and positive. LLC editor believes that some of these complaints (e.g. about review turnaround time) may not be justified. Generally good feedback from authors on the LLC publication process.

p.14ff: Production schedule has been very good, with all but one issues on time or ahead of schedule. LLC turnaround times are extremely quick in comparison with other humanities journals.

Page budget: last year slightly under-budget; this year quite a bit over-budget.

p.17: Marketing at conferences. Sarah calls for correction of any omissions, as well as suggestions for any meetings we might be attending that are not in the current marketing campaign. OUP will be happy to offer sample journals, advertising materials, etc.

Promotion on OUP blog, TOC alerts, and some new marketing materials.

Sarah's contact info is included; she invites feedback.

Chair presents to Sarah the issues noted in the previous discussion:

Currency: Sarah reports a new e-commerce development, and is hopeful that a new, and

independent currency figuring. It's somewhat down the line for development, but within next few years. Not in place for next year.

Subscription process frustrations: Sarah reports that there is an auditing package in place that reports at which point a subscription process fails. OUP has been directly contacting people with apparent troubles for followup. NF expresses appreciation with prompt and helpful OUP customer service, but still worries about (potential) members who don't complain. Sarah reports fewer complaints over the past year. Is considering comparing subscription list, contacting subscribers who have dropped off the list, etc. General agreement that this would be of great help.

Sarah reports (in response to DB question) that failure rate is approx. 10%; Sarah believes (unconfirmed) that everybody who had trouble eventually did subscribe, during followup. DB reports that he knows of some who have indeed fallen through the net.

Question about recurring credit card charges; Sarah will take this feedback to OUP -- although says that some people had complained about being charged unexpectedly (which is why the recurring charge option was dropped). **Action on Secretariat: follow up with Sarah about automatically recurring membership renewal.**

Open Access: Chair reiterates our desires in this regard. Sarah reports that OUP's OA policy is mainly based on movement in the UK gov't. (Also looking at developments in US, Europe and Australia, but focus is on UK.) Recommendation made a few months still stands, and has been offered to all OUP journals, which have adopted the recommendation to varying degrees -- some have declined OA altogether, others have gone even further (e.g., with longer embargo periods).

Sarah cites evidence that libraries may cancel if embargo period too short. Question: what sort of evidence is this? Does it depend on geography? on journal package deals? Sarah: predominantly evident in one-off subscriptions, in a survey conducted by publishers' consortium, which reports that, in the abstract, 65% of libraries responding say that they would consider cancellation in case of short embargo. Sarah also encourages us to view the current situation as a first step only, and subject to change.

Proposal to offer ourselves as a test case, to see whether that is actually true. Sarah believe such a proposal would be welcomed (although it's not something she is empowered to agree to); believes it could be quite useful to have such an experiment -- although OUP would consider it a high risk. Point made that the UK OA requirements pertain only to about 5-10% of UK-funded research.

Question: could any author individually take option of Gold OA? Response by LLC editor: Yes. Sarah: the RCUK requirements are the very reason for current discussions on OA.

Question: Does OUP have, and would it share, data on how many authors have taken advantage of the various OA levels? Sarah, others: That would very difficult for any non-Gold, although Gold is well documented.

Question: why such a high price for Gold? Other totally OA journals charge substantially less. Sarah responds that hybrid publishers generally have higher fees, because of differences in

funding and revenue model.

Sarah confirms (at Chair's prompting) that OUP would indeed welcome an experimental approach to OA. **Action on Harold: follow up with OUP to propose moving forward with such OA experimentation, with LLC/ADHO as the experimental subject.**

2:00. Publications Committee (Kathleen Fitzpatrick (KF) via Skype, 30 min.)

Plan for reviewing new publications for ADHO affiliation

What kinds of distinctions in this process should be drawn between ADHO-sponsored (i.e., financially supported) and ADHO-affiliated (i.e., sponsored in name only) publications?

Are there different kinds of relationships w/pubs that we should reconsider as ADHO expands: that is, more than just the two “ADHO Pubs” and “in-name ADHO infrastructure/sponsorship/endorsement”. KF recommends stepping back and looking at the finer distinctions, as well as considering protocols for bringing new pubs into the fold. Pubs Cmte ran into this problem of categorization, and seeks guidance from the SC on how to proceed.

Noted are categories of affiliation: “financial support”, and “infrastructure support”, and a third category: those that don’t require infrastructure, but only want an ADHO imprimatur. (KF notes that this may be a subcategory of the second.)

Point made that, e.g., *Topics in DH* series is just a “friendly affiliation.” Suggestion that “affiliation” could simply require, or not, infrastructure support.

Possibility noted of Spanish-language publications. What might this mean for ADHO “affiliation”?

Noted that DS/CN is now considering non-English articles (thanks to GO::DH input).

Question: is the question whether publication financial relationship is w/ each CO -- such that, e.g., JADH might feel “missing out” on a CO subvention?

Chair gauges generally sympathy in the room for providing COs with subventions, and letting them do with it what they want. Identifies this as an important issue, though probably not amenable to solution today. Calls on Pubs Cmte to break down question in a more granular way, along with some analysis / scenarios.

Two related questions: soliciting more publications / projects (e.g. from other COs), and (more pressing), what is the protocols for, e.g., a “friendly affiliation”; are current procedures sufficient?

Chair suggests using a protocol similar to that for existing ADHO sponsorship / "blessing" of conferences, and using it as a model for publications affiliation/imprimatur

Protocol for subventions of new ADHO CO publications (e.g., JADH and aaDH)

Current pub subventions are to journals, not to COs, even in the case for the newest pub

(centerNet's). NF will seek a kind of template in centerNet's proposal for extending to other CO pubs

Note that DHQ has not been heavily taxing on ACH funds or infrastructure. Difference noted in cost btw using its own and using ADHO's infrastructure has been minimal. Note that DHQ has actually been receiving several different subventions (direct; infrastructure; add'l ACH monies).

Suggestion made, and confirmed (from point of view of a new CO), that it would be extremely useful to have clarity around a known set of ADHO protocols and principles regarding publication support.

Mention made of a previous conversation in support of "wetware" (e.g. shared human infrastructure, grad student labor, etc).

Even though Chair characterizes our contribution to this discussion as "bumping the Pub Cmte's questions back down", KF thanks us for all the suggested models. **Action on Publications Cmte: propose a protocol for subventions of new ADHO CO publications.**

2:30. Conference Coordinating Committee (Ray, 60 min.)

RS thanks JN for stepping up with CCC work during the past year when extra help required.

Report on 2013 conference (5-10 mins; Bethany, Kay)

BN: very active year on the PC, with experiments, etc. Quite high acceptance rate, thanks to an additional track, as well as an exceptionally large number of posters: 67% acceptance rate overall. Cites success in both expanding access to more entries, and maintaining rigor in the acceptance. Notes somewhat higher than normal last-minute withdrawals due to failures in travel funding.

Summary of changes in PC work: revised instructions for reviewers; simplified CFP; began collecting reviewer language competencies; updated and modernized subject areas available to reviewers; expanded reviewer pool in underrepresented languages and regions; new bidding process by reviewers; improvement in collegiality through transparency (reviewers could view other reviews, after submission); scoring sheets modified (removing two entire categories in scoring: relevance to conference, and presentation of proposal -- seen as linguistic or disciplinary gatekeeping). Created new option for authors' responses / rebuttals to reviews. BN doesn't have number of how many authors took advantage of this -- but reports 400(!) extra pages of reading for her! Recommends continuing this practice, but explicitly limiting e.g. word count. Used ConfTool's capacity to flag high and low reviewers.

Many other increases in flexibility, taking greater advantage of existing capabilities in ConfTool, requiring no new programming. "It's a Ferrari, and we had been driving it like a jalopy."

Upshot: in contrast to previous years, no noticeable negative feedback on social media after review process. BN notes that these were all experiments, largely very positive. JN and RS note that the feedback from these experiments is taken seriously by CCC in light of protocols

KW: 460 registrants! Book of abstracts 576 pp. (most receiving it on flash drive; ca. 70 copies in print). Notes that production of the Book was immensely labor-intensive, ca. 3 months of staff time. Cites far too many submissions in PDF, inconsistency in styles, abuses in number of citations, number and size of figures, etc.

Question: how much time would have been saved, if there were a centralized system for production of the Book. KW: unclear, but TEI requirement was certainly labor-intensive. Possibly $\frac{1}{3}$ of the time could have been saved if there had been a TEI template for submissions.

Question whether CCC has considered shorter abstract lengths; noted that there are already limits in place. Noted that current length seemed to be an absolute minimum in many points of view. Some words in support of keeping the abstracts of substantial length -- since many of these papers don't make it into print in any other form. All are in favor of not apologizing for much stricter enforcement of norms and templates for abstract submissions.

Intense time frame from PC's point of view noted, since CFP comes very soon after conclusion of previous conference.

Regarding difficulty of publishing Book of Abstracts, suggestion made simply to disallow PDF in ConfTool would be a big help, from Local Host's point of view. DO volunteers to work on TEI template; question asked regarding Stanford experience in 2011; suggestion that LaTeX is de rigueur for CS conferences.

Action item: DO will talk to GW about TEI template for conference Book of Abstracts, KW to move quickly on a template.

Future action item on Publications Cmte: how to enable Book of Abstracts to be considered a "publication", citable on CV, etc.

Registration opens today 3 pm. Details on plenary sessions (all streamed); other sessions not being recorded. Concurrent sessions in Embassy Suites and on adjacent buildings on campus.

Update on 2014 conference plans (5-10 mins; Melissa, Claire & Frederic)

Claire presents conference logo (with embedded Swiss flag in the H!). Travel update: easy access from both airports. DH2014 was a big help in pulling together DH activities in Lausanne.

Theme: "Digital Cultural Empowerment." Seeking impact on local residents, and on the city. Perhaps a "digitization party" - flash mob creating a 3-d model of the city. Review of lovely conference venues (incl. some buildings still under construction). Proposed "DH photo booth" with professional photographer, to construct "DH Facebook".

Conference dinner event on the lake. On a boat!

Excursions to CERN, chocolate, Gothic Lausanne.

Childcare solutions in place, including circus, excursions, etc.

MT: PC 2014 update.

Opening keynote: Bruno Latour; closing keynote: Sukanta Chaudhuri. MT notes the very vigorous and invigorating discussion on PC about gender and nationality diversity in keynotes.

We also now have better gender statistics on submissions and acceptances (both are 65% male and 35% female -- a bit of a relief that the review process appears not to have gender bias).

Claire notes that the Lausanne conference is helping unite Francophone DH, possible creation of an association. DO makes suggestion to post a call in French on GO::DH.

Review of annual report, and issues for current / future consideration (brief)

RS notes CCC's new charge to review conf. protocols, in-name conf. sponsorships -- but also a lot of new issues coming into CCC (largely positive).

Training, next steps (brief)

Following on last year's discussion, notes that all of our training institutes are thriving; at NF's prompting to dedicate more time to this question, **RS will be leading that effort -- and thus is asking to be released from duties as CCC chair, and recommends JN as replacement.**

3:30. Bids for DH2015 (Ray, 60 min.)

The Steering Committee heard presentations from the two organizations bidding to host the 2015 DH conference:

- University of Western Sydney (presented by Paul Arthur)
- A joint proposal from a group of universities based in Montreal (presented by Stéfan Sinclair)

Discussion: redacted.

JN would like to go on record saying that whichever bid is not accepted should be *strongly* encouraged to resubmit.

Decision: Sydney.

Comments: Strong sentiment that Montreal should be encouraged to resubmit. Recommendation that Sydney should be encouraged to work on travel funding opportunities, streaming of proceedings, etc.

Chair: Strong appreciation for taking the time for this long and difficult conversation and decision.

5:30. Review of delayed discussion points (Glen, 15 min.)

- Inclusivity proposal (BN)
- Regional Associate Organization proposal (HS)
- Cover "Broadening Admissions Committee Membership" and "Affiliates" topic, for

which we ran out of time (HS)

5:45. Articulation and listing of decisions requiring ratification by COs (answer required for meeting on 16 July) (Glen, 15 min.)

- COs should make committee appointments
- COs should confirm ADHO budget distribution and expenditures as presented by Treasurer
- Percentage representation on SC: PS will announce tonight
- aaDH will provide chair of PC 2015

7:00. Constituent Organizations' Joint Executive Dinner: **Van Brunt Visitor Center, 13th & Q Streets** (drinks start at 6:15)

RE-CONVENED MEETING: Tuesday, July 16, 2013; 9:00 a.m.

9:00. Matters remaining from Day 1 Agenda (75 minutes)

Regional Associate Organization proposal + constitution of Admissions Committee (Harold, 15 min.)

People seem generally content with idea of Associate Organizations, as well as the 3 types of AOs. Two concerns: we shouldn't make link btw CO and AO a mandatory one, but rather one that may emerge in discussions, as needed. (i.e., if a CO would like to have a relationship with a proposed AO, that is between the two of them.) Shall we leave this open?

Extension of membership-only approach to all members: seems to be a decided matter, and OUP will do whatever we want: set the charge, change the website, etc. -- as long as we inform them by Nov. 1 for the incoming year. OUP has agreed to implement whatever terms we require. We could also use OUP category of developing countries, where they give free or reduced rates (as done with centerNet).

Model of 50% return of income would remain without any tax. May not be sensible to try to do this for 2014.

Request for two qualifications on these points:

1) with membership-only, we may be preparing Membership-only status: may be leading us toward open-access path more quickly.

2) With associate status: recommends great caution to avoid impression of "second-class" status of

HS: notes that this would just be a starting point, not a requirement.

Note that it's easy to get burned by making too many assumptions about what a regional AO may want to do. HS: noted.

Question regarding calculations of membership-only rate: does it imply reduced rate at

conferences? HS: yes.

Noted that low-cost Student memberships imply a subsidized journal subscription anyway, so it should be noted that we want this, in order to stimulate subscription to LLC. Looking at it from an incentive point of view, not the cost point of view.

HS clarifies that there is no extra cost to us for membership-only model -- but response noted that there are still potential losses in the overall cost, since the journal still needs to be produced, no matter how many people choose not to subscribe.

Chair: in the interests of time, we ask HS to produce a report which we can discuss over email.

MS moves to agree that we are moving forward with membership-only option. Motion carries. Action on Secretariat to remind Neil / SC of Nov. 1 deadline to inform OUP of terms to implement "membership-only" option for upcoming membership year.

Admissions Committee Membership (Harold)

Should this be a representational committee, or remain a smaller one (as at present)?

Note that if there will be more entry points into our structure, the Adm Cmte will obviously have more to talk about; should it perhaps be expanded somewhat, if not made permanent?

HS: Cmte currently consists of 3 appointed: RS, JU, and HS. Was always seen as interim.

Noted: recent experience shows that at least some recently joined COs may help with their enthusiasm.

HS: Need to make this process more formal at the very least. Also anticipates his own stepping down at some point in the near future. So the question is: should the Admissions Cmte be representational, or appointed?

Expressions in favor of approach that each CO will want a voice, BUT (concurring with others in room) that we should limit that to ONE member per CO, no listeners, etc.

Proposal to agree on the principle that when the question comes to actual admission, the decision should be unanimous by all existing COs.

Suggestion that it would be wise to bring in consulting members as needed (e.g., from Mexico, where the process is very far along).

ACTION item on Harold: provide a protocol for Admissions Committee to SC for discussion and approve on email.

Multi-Lingual Multi-Cultural Committee (Elisabeth, 15 min.)

EB refers to posted report for all details. Summary: Accomplishment was to review existing protocol and to actualize it. Another major accomplishment (thanks to PC 2013, RS and CCC): stabilizing the CfP made it much easier to read, to translate, and to disseminate. EB notes that

the cooperation was very positive and helpful. Another accomplishment: in ConfTool, collecting language information (mother tongue of reviewer/submitter, and languages available for review) not as free text, but as database-enabled entries. Emphasizes that the translation of the CfP is a form of outreach, with the goal of making the conference and community more inclusive.

EB: some things could not be accomplished because discussions happened outside normal channels of communication. One agreement on big questions: MLMC can't really serve as "translation consultants". However, MLMC has broken down, systematized and specified the activities that we do believe to be our business. Hoping to make it possible, little by little, to clarify research agenda, concrete duties, and out-of-scope topics.

EB notes importance of MLMC "passive diversity base" document -- needs to be forwarded to CCC (**action on Elisabeth; done**) and added to meeting documents (**action on GW;done**). Wishes to clarify that MLMC is not a "translation agency" -- but more pragmatically, MLMC does own the task of advocacy for continuing to translated the CfP into as many languages as possible. MLMC does agree to help coordinate volunteers, and sees it as a way to encourage younger members to be active in the Association, to have their names (as translators) connected to their translations.

MLMC urges ADHO (and COs) to all make their websites more multilingual.

Question of how many languages should be represented: we cannot specify this number, but only propose being sensitive to the number and variety of languages currently spoken in a particular community, and continually examine this list and number of languages. Finally, if there are previously unrepresented languages, we encourage volunteer translations into those languages.

Comment: recognizing that MLMC is not translation agency -- would still like to have entered into protocols WHICH committee is responsible for translation. It CANNOT be the PC that is responsible, since it has so many other intense duties at the same time. This must be entered into protocol documents.

General agreement that these clarifications should be entered into Conference Protocol: that MLMC is responsible to gather, but not do, the translations, and that the PC does not have any responsibility for translations.

Chair: we'll clarify the actual line that goes into which Conference document. (**Action on JN and EB/MLMC: to add appropriate "multilingual CFP statement" to Conference protocol document(s).**)

Awards Committee (Øyvind, 15 min.)

Fortier Prize: One member of Cmte had to step down, and Karina is taking it up this year. Still need a rep from JADH. Last year there were some problems with understanding who is able to apply for bursaries. This has likely been solved by clearer language in the Call, and by student category of membership. Need to make more clear that bursary INCLUDES student membership. Will be done for next year. Three main issues:

1) Number of bursaries increased this year. OE looks forward to better fundraising and more

bursaries in coming years (thanks to donations, once banking / incorporation solution is in place). OE asks for advice on how we can increase more bursaries. Stable number of applications: 30-40. In one sense, all are deserving (since their papers have been accepted). Some problems with statement on bursaries: no clear criteria on selection. Assumed: scholarly quality is the main criterion. However (as GO::DH experience has shown), scholarly quality is highly culturally dependent. How to resolve? OE says this is the hardest of unanswered questions. E.g., Should we focus on low-income countries independently of scholarly quality?

Action item on OE and Awards Cmte: to propose a set of bursary guidelines for discussion over email.

2) Amount of bursary: is 500 GBP the right level, or should we raise it? Can it depend on required travel distance? (thus making the amounts unequal)

Noted that in Canada, percentage of costs is taken into consideration. Long-distance travel receives, e.g., 50% of airfare; short-distance receives less.

Question: what costs are allowable under bursary? OE: there is a list.

Note that TEI has used, e.g., US State Dept procedures to determine per diem, etc. Would be worthwhile to look into this, or other gov't guidelines. OE will look into the possibility.

Question: what about fundraising to support bursaries? ADHO now large enough that we ought to be looking at more sources of income. How about having a small group start thinking about fundraising? Local orgs. always have to do fundraising, and have learned, e.g., that corporations are not very forthcoming with funds, but our own institutions often are. Grant possibilities? KW would be willing to serve on a group to look into these. NF calls for other volunteers. **Action: KW convenes small group: RS, DO, OE. Not just restricted to awards fundraising.**

Noted, re: scholarly quality question: we should rely on our existing peer review process.

Desire express to reiterate the idea that cost figuring should be kept simple. Fewer rules are better than more.

Inclusivity proposal (Bethany, 15 min.)

BN has composed "terms of reference" doc (posted with meeting docs), which may be titled differently, but proposes this draft as a beginning. Reads text, and notes that it is purposefully not highly prescriptive, and not overly heavy -- but rather as a lightweight consultancy to any and all existing groups, always available upon request by SC or any other group, appointed on case-by-case basis. BN recommends that a coordinator be appointed. Project-oriented basis, with deadlines, and endpoints.

Responses from SC members:

- Happy with everything said, would like the word "traditionally" struck.
- Appreciates down-to-earth and practical thinking, would be extremely useful.
- Would like to note need to focus on disciplinary diversity as well. BN: this is

purposefully vague to allow all types of inclusivity. Suggestion made to provide more clarity in this sense, since “diversity” is so seldom understood to include disciplines. Question whether this inclusivity officer would also be a resource to members at large, as well as SC. BN: prefers to think of this as not a public officer receiving petitions, but rather that members-at-large would first work through their COs to bring things to SC attention. COs offer possibility of providing more context for a particular question or problem.

Clarification that there are two things to note here. 1) This is a generalized mechanism for enabling inclusivity. 2) Our own protocols may be among first things requiring review by this community. BN notes that the first group to operate under this protocol will set the tone for future work. Would like to insist on general principle that this effort is not at all meant to “swoop in and police your protocol”.

KW moves to adopt this document, MT/TT second. Motion passes unanimously.

Chair: the working group will work first with the ADHO protocols. **Action on BN: will scope out the collection of ADHO protocols, and return a sense of how large the task as, and what sort of working group will be required.**

Additional item emerging from discussion of upcoming conference

1) Offer by Lausanne hosts to provide TEI template for documents

2) General sense that we should pare down current number of people on the PC list. Its size has already become a problem. Proposal just to remove such people from the list: specifically, the CO listeners. Proposal instead to explicitly stipulate the membership of the list. Suggestion that we simply need to trust the people we've already chosen. Question: How about MLMC? Can it remain a member until a certain point in the process? After some discussion, proposal not to include MLMC, just as with other listeners.

Restating the motion: *the clause in the Protocol specifying the members of the PC list will remain as is, up until the point that “listening members” are listed -- and struck from there forward.*

KW seconds JN’s motion, which carries unanimously.

Secretariat tasked with doing an inventory of the PC membership lists, in order to facilitate trimming. **Action on Secretariat: inventory current PC list membership in order to de-bloat it.**

Thanks expressed to Frédéric for offer of template creation, but notes that whatever happens should be easily implementable in ConfTool. **Action on Ray and Frédéric (and ?): determine whether some sort of TEI template can be implemented in ConfTool in time for DH2014.**

10:15. Break

10:30. Constituent Organisation reports (10 min. each; 60 mins.)

aaDH -- see also more detailed written [aaDH Report](#) graciously submitted by Paul A.

PA: aaDH now in third year; inaugural conference held last year. Thanks to all aaDH members, including joint members. Last year: consolidation activities, with 4 main efforts:

- 1) election of officers: 3 new officers on Board, 2 from Australia, 1 from NZ. Currently 13 members, will be reducing number to 9.
- 2) choice of venue to bid to host 2014 aaDH conference: U. of Western Australia. Proposals received from NZ, although earthquake prevented acceptance. Decided that conferences will be biennial.
- 3) ongoing development of protocols and governing docs. aaDH incorporated as legal entity in 2012, and a gov't change in regulations required immediate changes, including rules for physical and virtual presence. Given large number of joint (thus remote) members, these rules complicate aaDH guidelines and practice.
- 4) increasing visibility of aaDH in region and world. 2 named sponsorship of events (including small funding in case of CAA). Working on formal relationships with other professional orgs, several are in process. May call upon centerNet for advice.

Comment on CAA cooperation, would like ADHO to consider an ADHO-level affiliation. HS suggests official "affiliate status"; will pursue.

Proposal to coordinate local CO conferences so as not to compete with ours. PA reports that this has worked well with JADH. Proposal also to gather data / dates about these. Chair offers ADHO infrastructure, e.g., use of ConfTool; RS has sent email with this same offer. RS notes timing of CSDH/SCHN, with open invitation to other CO members to do likewise. Suggestion that we may already have an inventory of "nearly quarterly" CO meetings. Also mentioned: publication of proceedings as another possible fruit of such coordination. **Action item on Lisa S. to gather dates of CO meetings and post them prominently on ADHO site.**

ACH

BN: One of our most meaningful acts of advocacy was to assist NEH in becoming included in White House OSTP conversations on open science and data. ACH feels we have done some very good work in this regard, with much promise for future funding, etc.

Encouraging everyone to participate in ACH activities at this conference: "please ask / do tell" stickers; Newcomers' dinners (motto: "No newbie dines alone!") -- about 90 newbies have expressed interest.

ACH will match EADH's GBP 5k donation to start ADHO nest egg.

ACH Exec had deep and substantive conversation about increasing regional focus of other COs, and whether ACH might also sponsor regional chapters; general agreement that this would be a wrong direction, and reaffirmed our non-US-centric regional focus for ACH, unless/until our membership demands otherwise. We will still engage in political advocacy, or sponsoring

regional meetups, or coordination with other North American COs, as our membership demands. ACH would like to ask ADHO to remain conscious of this stance while promoting umbrella-level activities like SIGs, and would like to play a key role in topical or disciplinary activities that cross national / geographical borders. ACH wants to work against even the potential to be seen as US-centric provincialism.

Chair: thanks to ACH for contribution to ADHO nest egg. General applause.

Expression of admiration for range of activities that ACH has taken; believes that some of these may be taken up at ADHO level. W/r/t regionalism: there is one aspect that is baked in to ADHO composition: no other CO has the right to take up e.g. national advocacy, nor to benefit from US subscriptions. In fact, every CO is in fact an international organization, and NONE of us wants to appear as imperialists. BN: ACH conversation about geographic identity was robust: not about claiming exclusive "borderlessness," but rather focusing on topical nature. Suggestion that we should like *all* COs to think of themselves as international. Any necessary regionalism should never be at the expense of international concerns.

Interest expressed in ACH's Open Science initiatives.

EADH (ALLC)

JN: report on membership-only policy. German association has expressed interest in being Associate of EADH; notes that subscription-less membership policy was central in that decision.

Committee memberships to be settled by email; JN would like to settle this question today if possible.

EADH updates its name, officially dropping the "ALLC" affix.

EV, as LLC editor: advocates for some compensation for editors, given LLC's importance to the community, and the work of 4 editors (EV, and 3 associates). EV interacts with OUP on two occasions annually (DH mtgs, and annual OUP editors mtg). EV meets physically with associate editors also on these occasions. Thus EV requests funding for editorial team to travel to DH conferences. Treasurer gives financial description of the importance of such travel funding: ADHO pays LLC subvention of 4,000 GBP, as well as backstop of 500, but historically, everything else has been paid directly by ALLC (now EADH), including for exec travel to conferences. Treasurer notes that OUP does return additional income for this kind of activity.

During recent budget reconciliation by PS, decided that since money is shared by ADHO, would like the cost also to be shared. Question: would this be a model for any kind of revenue-producing activity? PS: yes. JM: Last year there was approval of 2,000 GBP for something similar, but it wasn't used. EV: notes that other funds are always sought outside ADHO (e.g., thanks to combining of ADHO travel with other, e.g., Saskatoon conf. travel, and to Isabel's keynote funded travel). So this 2,000 GBP travel allocation is a backstop. Treasurer will incorporate this into budget, aiming higher for budgeting purposes. **NF calls for formal vote to approve this practice, both in the specific case of LLC editor, and the general principle that all revenue-producing activities can also rely on ADHO to share costs incurred in those activities. This is not blanket approval, but rather pre-approval is required. Unanimously supported.** Noted that we should be aware of any extension of "programmatic" activity to "ad

hoc” activities.

MT: proposes to fund a new prize in honor of Lisa-Lena Opas-Hänninen, to pay for two young scholars, once per year, to attend *other* (non-ADHO) conferences. Proposal was made originally to EADH, but would like to propose to all of ADHO. Proposed level is ca. GBP 1,500, choice of recipients would rotate among COs. Given strong general sense that ADHO would like to take this up, JN will prepare and circulate proposal to ADHO. Question: At which point would this be turned over to ADHO Awards? OE: if it will be a rotating prize, it needs to last at least for 6 years. JN: Awards Cmte will review before circulating proposal. **Action on John N.: Prepare proposal for Lisa-Lena memorial prize as described; give to Awards Cmte for review, then circulate to SC.**

centerNet

KW: Final aspect of transition to CO: reorganization of structure, up from 2 members per region, a larger number of ca. 25 members, to be circulated to entire membership, with slate to have focus on diversity. Twice yearly meetings, once at DH, and once at some host institution.

centerNet will have a half-day conference adjacent to DH meetings.

Working on cleanup of website data on centers, hoping to enable better data analysis and more accurate information on centers.

Efforts underfoot to foster healthy creation and sustaining of new centers. These efforts will continue.

CSDH/SCHN

MS: continue with annual conferences, still successful (95 participants in Victoria). Extending workshop series, and further plans to continue extending DH via Canadian Federation.

Extending student integration, outreach to new generation. Further work afoot to increase funding for DH, taking advantage of climate led by Chad Gaffield.

SB is new English-language president of CSDH/SCHN; will replace MS as voting member of SC next year.

JADH

CM: 2012: second annual JADH conference (Tokyo). 95 participants from 43 different associations. Very international and open, esp. given typically more closed nature of Japanese academic culture. Conference language was English, with many keynotes from ADHO people.

Preparing for 2013 conference. Program set, conference website up. As before, there's a high international participation.

JADH working toward publication of a journal; planning on a bilingual pub. Anticipate a “proceedings” issue as inaugural.

Main challenge is in penetrating the language, given large number of DH activities in Japan that

may not be aware of related international activities.

Organizationally located at U. Tokyo, but leadership (esp. Masahiro) now in midst of possible transitions that should enhance ability to run DH better in Japan, given personnel and other organizational issues.

Fortunate that many people are happy to travel to Japan when invited! No trouble getting excellent international speakers to come to Japan and foster collaborations and mentoring of young Japanese scholars.

11:30. Confirming voting membership of ADHO SC; other SC appointments (Neil, 5 min.)

(as of end of DH2013)

- aaDH: - 1 member: Paul Arthur
- ACH: - 2 members: Bethany Nowviskie, Stéfan Sinclair
- EADH (ALLC): - 3 members: Chris Meister, Melissa Terras, Paul Spence
- centerNet: - 1 member: Kay Walter
- CSDH/SCHN - 1 member: Michael Sinatra
- JADH - 1 member: Masahiro Shimoda

JN confirms the following:

- Treasurer & Deputy Treasurer: PS and JM
(NF expresses gratitude for JM's willingness to serve.)

- Secretariat (review 2012 decision to have 2 secretaries)

NF asks for endorsement of retaining 2 secretaries for one more year, then to revisit in 2014 whether to enact this arrangement in protocol. Motion carries.

Formal approval of budget

Noted that formal budget approval process needs to be revisited, given lack of some CO meetings during DH conference (i.e., after the budget has been presented). Treasurer notes that the budget has been sent pro-actively to COs, and requests more general approval. Suggestion made that for future years, the COs could simply enfranchise their SC reps to approve the budget on behalf of CO. Unclear from the protocol whether this sort of change is subject "SC approval" or "approval of all COs"? Suggestion made that each CO should set its own policy toward requirements for approval.

Noted, with concurrence, that the formal approval process, e.g., by CSDH/SCHN, will require a longer post-conference period. Either budget is submitted for approval before conference, and first ADHO SC meeting simply ratifies that, or the ratification process extends past the DH conference. Treasurer notes that decisions that affect the budget are often taken during the meetings. Would like to be flexible, but still needs to be done in a formal manner.

General agreement that pre-meeting discussion method is better, but if there is disapproval, a post-meeting requirement still required. Treasurer proposes: at first SC meeting, we approve the

budget in principle, with acknowledgment that minor adjustments may be made.

Secretariat reminder: Sept 1 deadline for budget approval from COs.

11:45. Review plan for ADHO/centerNet lunch session (SIG slam) (15 min.)

Program: Brief period for each to outline its activities for the year. Theme for meeting: “International DH”, with presentations by Isabel Galina and Ryan Cordell, then DO and Alex Gil on global outlook generally, then specifically GO::DH, then SIG slam. Culmination of SIG slam is a retreat into various corners of the room in order to garner support, gather names, etc.

12:00. ADHO Incorporation report (John N., 30 min.)

Summary: original charge to John Unsworth and JN to report on possibilities of incorporation, which led to narrowing of possibilities to UK and Dutch options; general consensus that Dutch was the better option, which was discussed and approved online. JN now has draft document from Notary on incorporation; asks SC feedback on several decision points.

Officers / Board of the Foundation required (and these must be separate from SC): JN will act as Founder, then will immediately withdraw; after that, the Board will be made of ex officio members of the SC, but will have to present themselves formally to Notary and to banking institutions. JN urges that this Board remain very small, given these personal-appearance requirements.

- 1) JN strongly recommends having an *official* translation of our founding documents. Translation will be recognized as official, but won't have legal status in case of conflict. (Est. total cost: 1500 GBP.)
- 2) Given explosion of interest in DH in Amsterdam (soon-to-be-founded large center), Karina van Dalen may be moving to Amsterdam from Hague; would like to propose that Amsterdam be the place of foundation.
- 3) Official name needed, so that everyone knows the legal basis.
- 4) Proposal to make SC president, secretary, treasurer as Board members. We should be careful not to paint ourselves into a corner. Suggests limiting to 5.
- 5) Foundation requires Netherlands postal address; JN offers his institutional address, but suggests moving it to Amsterdam at some point.
- 6) PS strongly recommends getting this done this year, in order to enable the Treasurer transition, as well as other bureaucratic EADH reasons.

Official certification of documents is important, but can only happen after incorporation.

PS: notes that in Wales, there are trustees who are no longer members of the board (e.g., ALLC trustees are HS and David Robey). So the Board doesn't need to be exactly the same people.

Personal responsibility only enabled in case of malfeasance.

No vote required or taken; general consensus that the proposals as given are accepted.

Action item on NF, PS, JN: confer on composition of the Board for the incorporated ADHO.

Varia

CM discusses H-Net concerns, possibly in relation to centerNet and ADHO. BN suggests using the ACH “affiliated organizations” mechanism.

Action on Secretariat: solicit/confirm names of specific CO representatives via email.

Confirmation of committee chairs (Glen, Neil)

- Steering Committee: chair: Neil Fraistat (July 2014); (see above for membership list)
- Publications Committee: chair: Kathleen Fitzpatrick (July 2015)
 1. EADH delegate: Espen Ore
 2. CSDH/SCHN: Dan O’Donnell (editor-in-chief DS/CN)
- Conference Coordinating Committee: John Nerbonne elected (unanimously) for term ending July 2016
 1. CSDH/SCHN: Brent Nelson
- Multilingual and Multicultural Committee: Elisabeth Burr (July 2014)
 1. EADH delegate: Maurizio Lana
 2. CSDH/SCHN: Michael Sinatra
- Infrastructure Committee: Chris Meister (July 2015)
- Awards Committee: Øyvind Eide (July 2014)
 1. CSDH/SCHN: Dean Irvine
 2. EADH: Karina van Dalen
- Program Committee 2015
 1. 2015 Chair from aaDH: Professor Deborah Verhoeven (also serving as 2014 vice-chair)
 2. 2015 PC membership
 - Jeremy Boggs (ACH)
 - Brian Croxall (ACH)
 - Øyvind Eide (EADH)
 - Karina van Dalen-Oskam (EADH)

NF expresses appreciation to all SC members for discussion and work accomplished.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 1:00 p.m.